REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 4, 2003 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gale et al (US 5692820).

Re Claim 3:

Gale et al discloses a desk, and consequently anticipates a personal workspace. The Examiner states in the office action dated June 4, 2003 on page 7 the following:

> *Gale et al does disclose a spatially confined, personal workspace because Gale et al discloses a desk in a room which is of course a spatially confined, personal workspace (Gale et al Col 2 line 28).*

Gale et al anticipates an operator location near the desk, as well as a personal space to do the computer related work. Gale et al teaches positioning a compact projection monitor capable of fitting on a working desk, consisting of a projection system able to fit inside an enclosure which is connected to a transmissive screen. Gale et al does not teach, suggest or anticipate positioning a projector on a desk, in a personal workspace that is spatially confined, as part of a new method of creating a projection monitor, with a non-transmissive reflective screen that is preferred not to be connected to the projector.

Gale et al discloses a projector in Fig. 4, a projector is typically used with a non-transmissive reflective screen, which may also be used with a transmissive screen. Consequently, Gale et al does disclose a non-transmissive reflective screen (Gale et al Col 6, line 55-56). Gale et al teaches that a transmissive screen could be used with the projector of Fig. 4 (Gale et al Col 6, line 50-56).

> *As explained previously, the projector 560 employs a plurality of single crystal silicon light valve matrices and an optical geometry for producing high resolution color (or monochrome) images. The resulting images are directed through a*

Received from < 301 962 8126 > at 9/30/03 3:35:00 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

zoom or fixed focal length projection lens 572 to form an image beam capable of being front or back projected onto a viewing surface or screen.

Gale et al teach that the projector in Fig. 4 can serve as an example of a conventional projector that could be adapted to be used for their invention. Gale et al does disclose a transmissive screen capable of front or back projection (Gale et al Col 2, line 15).

The screen can take a number of forms to provide varying degrees of light redirection to accommodate the preferences of a user...

Further, the Examiner states in the office action dated June 4, 2003 on page 7 and 8 the following:

The Applicant argues (Applicants response entered 3-4-03 p.3 line 28-30) that the screen shown in Gale et al Fig. 4 is a transparent screen and not a reflective screen and is not capable of being front or back projected.

The Inventor was stating that Gale et al did not teach, suggest or anticipate employing a non-transmissive screen with their invention consisting of a projection system inside an enclosure connected to a screen. A reflective screen may have non-transmissive and transmissive properties. Inventor teaches that the new method of creating a projection monitor partly consists of a reflective screen, and this reflective screen has only non-transmissive properties. Gale et al teach that the screen in their invention may have transmissive or non-transmissive properties enabling a screen to have front and back projection capabilities. For example, a transparent screen has mostly or completely transmissive properties. Gale et al teaches that screen in their invention must have some transmissive properties.

Gale et al disclose a projector and a non-transmissive reflective screen, and projector produces a projected computer image, which is normally directed to the disclosed screen, that inherently is reflected from the non-transmissive screen, as described above. The Examiner states in the office action dated June 4, 2003 on page 8 the following:

Gale et al does disclose reflecting a computer image from a non-transmissive reflective screen because Gale et al says that the image produced by its projector results from signals received from a computer (Gale et al Col 7, line 32 and Col 7, line 40)...

Received from < 301 962 8126 > at 9/30/03 3:35:00 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Projectors used in the prior art manners like presentations in conference rooms or auditoriums are directed from a central location to project a computer image towards a non-transmissive reflective screen, reflecting the projected image from the non-transmissive reflective screen to the audience and not to the presenter or presenter's location having operational access to the projector or the computer connected to the projector. Gale et al does anticipate a projector and a non-transmissive reflective screen. Gale et al does not anticipate a new method of creating a projection monitor based on reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location. A first operator location arranged in proximity to the positioning of the projector itself within the personal workspace having a spatially confined area. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

In light of these new supporting arguments for independent claim 3, dependent claims 4, 5, and 6 being dependent upon and further limiting the independent claim, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Received from < 301 962 8126 > at 9/30/03 3:35:00 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Re Claim 24:

Gale et al does disclose a first operator location in a personal workspace having operational access to the computer connected to their invention of the projection monitor of Gale et al. Gale et al anticipates an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on their invention of the projection monitor because using projection monitor of Gale et al instead of a conventional computer monitor reduces eyestrain. The Examiner states in the office action dated June 4, 2003 on page 8 the following:

> *...Gale et al says that the image produced by its projector results from signals received from a computer and the operator inherently must have operational access to the computer and reduced eyestrain is an inherent result of using a projector in place of a monitor (Gale et al Col 7, line 32 and Col 7, line 40).*

Gale et al does not teach, suggest or anticipate an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, as described above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Received from < 301 962 8126 > at 9/30/03 3:35:00 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gale et al (US 5692820) in view of Rohr (US 4708312)

Re Claim 14:

Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector, supported by an adjustable arm, to project a computer image to a non-transmissive reflective screen. The Examiner states in the office action dated June 4, 2003 on page 9 the following:

> *Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector to project a computer image while the projector is on an adjustable arm because the adjustable arm of Rohr is disclosed as being capable of holding a video display apparatus or projection monitor (Rohr Col 1, line 9-10) such as the one disclosed by Gale et al as noted above.*

It would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to invent a new method of creating a projection monitor based on reflecting the computer image, produced by a projector mounted on an adjustable arm, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, as described above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

In light of these new supporting arguments for independent claim 14, dependent claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 being dependent upon and further limiting the independent claim, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Received from < 301 962 8126 > at 9/30/03 3:35:00 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Re Claim 30:

Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector, supported by an adjustable arm, to project a computer image to a non-transmissive reflective screen. It would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to invent a new eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on reflecting the computer image, produced by a projector mounted on an adjustable arm, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, as described above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

Inventor believes the claims, are patentable over the prior art, and that this application is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2003

Endale G. Haile-mariam
2712 Henderson Ave
Wheaton, MD 20902
P: (301) 962-9220
F: (301) 962-8126

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Received from < 301 962 8126 > at 9/30/03 3:35:00 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]